PATTERNS OF POWER

The Three Monopolies

✦

The Keystone Synthesis — That the Elite Is Never a Group but a Position, Whoever Is Exempt From Labour Yet Owns Most of Everything; That Every Durable Hierarchy Converges on Three Monopolies — Violence, Wealth, and Trusted Information — Bracing One Another Into a Tripod No Single Leg's Fall Can Topple; That the Trusted-Information Monopoly Is Load-Bearing, Because the Mind Fires on Trust and Verifies Only a Sliver of What It Must Believe, and Is Guarded by the Other Two, Which Silence, Buy, or Clone Any Rival Pipe; That in Five Thousand Years No Subjugated People Has Durably Crossed Into Equality, and No Nation Today Escapes the Few's Ownership of the Most; a Tendency, Never a Law — Held as Tested, Not Revealed

THOMAS J. BRYAN (WITH CLAUDE, ANTHROPIC)

A STUDY IN THE PATTERNS OF POWER

What This Document Is

THIS IS THE KEYSTONE — THE SINGLE PAGE TO READ FIRST IN any future session, the one that brings the whole picture together before a case is run. It states, in one frame, what the framework (*The Floor and the Robe*), the method (*Position Logic*), and the two lines of the corpus — the hold traced from above and the mind traced from below — all converge upon: that a durable hierarchy is held by a few who come to control three monopolies at once, that the three brace one another into a structure no single blow can topple, and that the load-bearing one is the monopoly over the information a population trusts, because trust is where the human mind is reachable. It returns the older vocabulary of *monopolies* deliberately, and shows that the three monopolies are not a rival framework but the same one named from a different angle: the floor of force is the monopoly on violence, the settlement is the monopoly on wealth and resources, and the robe — the managed belief carried through the seam — is the monopoly on trusted information. What the recent work adds, and what this document fixes in place, is *why the third monopoly is the keystone and why it is nonetheless the hardest to break*: because it rests on a feature of cognition that cannot be removed, and because it is guarded by the other two.

It is written to be used. The synthesis comes first, in prose; a compact operating section at the end maps the three monopolies onto the twelve modules so that any case can be run through this lens without losing the method. The present-day figures are verified and attributed. The framework is held, as always, as tested, not revealed — a tendency and never a law, true almost everywhere and nowhere quite total.

The Argument in Seven Parts

1 — The Elite Is a Position, Not a Group. Never name the elite by identity — WASP, Nazi, Levite, party, caste — because that hides the invariant. The invariant is positional: whoever is exempt from labour yet owns most of everything. The underclass is the mirror: whoever must labour to live, or cannot labour and barely lives. The costume changes each century; the position does not.

2 — The Three Monopolies. Every durable hierarchy converges on control of three things — organised violence, wealth and resources, and trusted information — and these are the floor of force, the settlement, and the robe, named in the older vocabulary. Three legs of one tripod.

3 — Why All Three, and Why Together. The three are not a list but a structure: each leg rights the other two, so that an order holding only one or two does not endure and does not reach the record. No one designed this. Elites found it by trial and error — position logic at scale, keeping whatever worked.

4 — The Load-Bearing Leg. Information is the leg you would attack, because belief is where the order is cheapest to hold and, seemingly, cheapest to break. But the asset is not information; it is the *pipelines the population trusts*, and trust is load-bearing because the mind cannot verify most of what it must believe. This is why attacking information alone fails: the other two legs silence, buy, co-opt, or clone any rival pipe.

5 — Five Thousand Years, and Today. Across the record, no subjugated population in an advanced civilisation has durably crossed into equality; a new non-labouring elite always re-forms around the same three monopolies. The present confirms it: there is no nation today in which the few do not own the majority — only differences of degree.

6 — The Honest Edge. It is a tendency, not a law, and never total. The one thing that has ever measurably improved a subjugated population's lot is not escaping the three monopolies, which has never happened, but forcing each to be held by more than one hand at once — contestability, not liberation.

7 — Running a Study Through the Three Monopolies. How the lens maps onto the twelve modules; the questions it adds; and the signatures of capture and of contestability that tell a better order from a worse.

PART 1

The Elite Is a Position, Not a Group

The first discipline, and the one that took longest to earn, is to refuse the group-label. Say WASP, Nazi, Levite, Brahmin, boyar, nomenklatura, party cadre, and you have already lost the pattern, because you have fixed your eye on the costume the position happened to wear in one place at one time, and the costume is the most variable thing about the whole structure. The invariant is not who occupies the apex but *what the apex is*, and the apex is a position defined by two facts held together: exemption from labour, and ownership of most of everything. Whoever does not have to work to live and yet holds the lion's share of the land, the office, the capital, the tribute — that person is the elite of his civilisation, whatever his race, creed, or banner. And the underclass is the exact mirror: whoever must labour to survive, or cannot labour and barely survives either way, holding little and able to leave for nowhere better. Between the two sits a graded middle whose size and security is itself one of the best single measures of how the order is doing.

Reading the elite as a position rather than a group is not a stylistic preference; it is what keeps the analysis honest and general. It keeps it honest because it stops the account from becoming a story about the wickedness of a particular people, which is both cruel and false — the position would be filled, and filled the same way, by whoever arrived there, and history obliges by swapping the occupants constantly while the position holds its shape. And it keeps the account general because it lets a single frame read a pharaoh's court and a modern shareholder class as instances of one thing:

not the same men, not the same beliefs, but the same position doing the same work. This is position logic applied to the apex itself. It is also, quietly, the whole reason the framework can be built at all, because a science of power that had to be rewritten for every new ruling group would be no science; only the positional reading yields an invariant to study.

PART 2

The Three Monopolies

What does that position actually hold? Across the whole record it converges on three things, and the convergence is the discovery. A durable hierarchy comes to control organised violence, it comes to control wealth and the resources wealth is drawn from, and it comes to control the information the population trusts — and where any one of these is missing for long, the order is not durable, which is why the orders that reached the record are the ones that assembled all three. These are the three monopolies, and they are not a new framework laid beside the old one; they are the old one seen from a different face. The framework's *floor of force* — the founding conquest, the standing capacity to punish — is the monopoly on violence. The framework's *settlement* — the division of the conquered wealth among the apex coalition, transmitted by inheritance and office and law — is the monopoly on wealth and resources. And the framework's *robe* — the managed belief laid over the force to make it cheap, carried through the interpreter class at the seam — is the monopoly on trusted information, of which belief is one category. Name them in the older vocabulary and you have violence, wealth, information. Name them in the framework's and you have the floor, the settlement, and the robe. They are the same three things.

It is worth being exact about what each monopoly buys, because they buy different work and that is why all three are needed. The monopoly on violence buys the floor: it makes the order enforceable at the point of the sword, disarms and holds the governed, and forecloses exit so that the

arrangement is a trap rather than a contract. The monopoly on wealth buys the settlement and the coalition: it feeds the apex, purchases the loyalty of the enforcers, and starves any rival concentration before it can grow into a competing centre. And the monopoly on trusted information buys the thing the other two cannot — *cheapness*. Force alone is ruinously expensive; a few cannot hold many by the sword, because the guards required would outnumber the guarded and would themselves have to be held. The trusted-information monopoly converts an order that must be enforced into one the governed defend and enforce upon themselves, from conviction, at their own cost. That is why the three are not interchangeable and why the third is the one that makes the whole thing pay.

PART 3

Why All Three, and Why Together

The deep point is that the three monopolies are not a checklist but a *structure* — a tripod, in which each leg rights the other two, so that the thing is stable in a way no single leg could be. Consider each pairing. A group that held only the monopoly on violence, and neither wealth nor the trusted story, would be a garrison in a hostile country: it could terrorise but not govern cheaply, would burn its surplus paying soldiers to watch a population that hated it, and would fall the moment the soldiers' loyalty — itself a matter of pay and belief — wavered. A group that held only wealth, without the sword or the story, would be rich prey, its fortune a target for whoever did hold the sword. And a group that held only the trusted story, without force or wealth behind it, would be a priesthood at the mercy of the king who fed and protected it — influential, but a client. It is only when the three are held together that each covers the others' exposure: the story makes the force cheap, the wealth pays the force and buys the interpreters, and the force protects the wealth and, at need, silences the rival story. Kick one leg and the other two right it. That mutual defence is the reason durable orders converge on all three, and it is also — as Part 4 will show — the reason the seemingly weakest leg is so hard to break.

And no one designed this. This is the single most important thing to hold against the conspiratorial reading, and it is the thing you saw from the pattern side long before the scholarship named the mechanism: the tripod was not theorised into existence by clever men who understood it. It was *found*, the way water finds the crack in the rock, by the pitiless trial and

error of rule. The priesthood whose story produced more reliable labour than the garrison outlasted the priesthood whose story did not; the dynasty that anointed itself and captured the temples outlasted the dynasty that only taxed; the regime that owned the trusted channels outlasted the regime that merely censored them. Each generation of rulers dealt with the problem in front of it, kept what worked and was rewarded with survival, and discarded or was buried with what did not — and what accumulated across fifty centuries of that winnowing was a practical mastery of the three monopolies held by people who never needed to understand *why* they worked. This is position logic at scale: the great pattern is only what a multitude of position-bound decisions add up to, seen from far enough away, with no History and no cabal above anyone's head. The elites hit on it. They are still hitting on it. And the analyst reconstructs by pattern what they assembled by blind selection.

PART 4

The Load-Bearing Leg: The Trusted Pipeline

Of the three, information is the one you would attack, and the instinct is sound: it is the load-bearing leg. Belief is where the order is held most cheaply, and therefore, it seems, where it is most vulnerable — pull the belief and the cheapness collapses, the force becomes ruinous again, and the order cannot pay for itself. This is why reformers and revolutionaries reach for the information leg, why the war on the old faith felt like the way out, why "if the people only knew" is the oldest hope in the repertoire. But the instinct fails in practice, reliably and structurally, and the recent work explains exactly why — and the explanation sharpens the target rather than abandoning it.

The first correction is that the elite's asset is not *information*; it is the *pipelines the population trusts*. Facts were never the thing. A population is not held by controlling every fact — that is impossible and unnecessary — but by owning the small number of channels through which the population takes its picture of the world on trust: the temple, the throne's heralds, the licensed press, the schoolroom, the credentialed expert, the platform. And trust is load-bearing because of a permanent feature of the human mind, the feature the corpus calls the exploit and the division of knowing: no person in a complex society can verify more than a sliver of what he must believe to live. He takes almost everything — the shape of the cosmos, the state of the nation, the safety of the medicine, the justice of the order — on trust, from

sources he cannot check, because a life is too short and the world too large to do otherwise. This is not the failing of the ignorant; it is the standing condition of every knower, including the expert, who is a layman about everything outside his sliver. The mind is built to route its knowing through trusted sources, and it fires on the *marks* of trust — the collar, the credential, the seal, the consensus, the costly display of sincerity — because in the small world those marks were reliable. Whoever owns the marks owns the routing. That is the trusted-pipeline monopoly, and it is the load-bearing leg because it is the one that reaches into the mind at the single point where the mind must take things on faith.

The second correction is why attacking that leg alone fails, and here the tripod does its lethal work. When a rival trusted pipeline appears — a new prophet, a free press, an independent school, a channel that begins to tell the population something the apex did not authorise — the elite does not need to win the argument, and usually does not try. It reaches for the other two legs. With the monopoly on violence it can silence the source: jail the printer, kill the prophet, ban the channel. With the monopoly on wealth it can do something subtler and more durable: buy the source, co-opt its owners, out-produce it with a lavishly funded version of its own, or simply purchase the platform outright and re-point it. And either way it can clone the marks of trust — stand up its own collared, credentialed, consensus-backed pipeline wearing exactly the signals the mind is built to believe. This is why you saw elites, across every civilisation, fight so ferociously over the trusted channels and comparatively little over raw facts: the channel was the asset, and the fight for it was existential. And it is why the information leg, which looks weakest, is in practice the best-defended: it is guarded by the two legs on either side of it. Strike it alone and you strike the one pillar the whole tripod is arranged to protect. The new pipe is silenced, bought, or cloned, and the trust it briefly won re-seats on the captor. That is the structural reason "seeing through" never got a population out: the seeing-

through was real, but the trust it freed had nowhere to go except into the next pipeline, which the elite, holding wealth and force, was positioned to own.

PART 5

Five Thousand Years, and Today

Put the tripod together with the mind's dependence on trust, and a long, hard empirical finding falls out, the one the whole search kept returning: across five thousand years of advanced civilisation, no subjugated population has durably crossed over into equality. Orders fall constantly — to conquest, to fracture, to exhaustion, to the overproduction of elites — but when the dust settles a new non-labouring elite has re-formed around the same three monopolies, holding the violence, the wealth, and the trusted channels, wearing new names and a new robe. The reason is now legible. A revolution that seizes the three monopolies has not abolished the tripod; it has re-manned it. It takes the sword, takes the confiscated wealth, and — because the population must trust *someone*, the seat of trusted belief being impossible to leave empty — builds its own trusted pipeline, its own catechism and its own interpreters, and stands them exactly where the old ones stood. The Soviet case is the pure demonstration: the church pipeline razed, a state pipeline built with its relics and saints and sealed canon, the same three monopolies standing under a red flag. The altar cannot be emptied; the chair never empties; the seam is recaptured, never removed.

The present confirms the finding with numbers anyone can check, and they are worth stating plainly, because the abstraction lives or dies on whether it still describes the world outside the window. It does. On wealth — the ownership the position is defined by — the concentration is near-total and universal. The World Inequality Database finds that in almost

every country the richest tenth hold more than half of all personal wealth, while the poorest half hold at most around a tenth; UBS's Global Wealth Report counts roughly sixty million adults, about 1.6 per cent of the world's adults, owning some 226 trillion dollars — close to half of all household wealth on earth — while the nearly forty per cent of adults with less than ten thousand dollars to their name hold under one per cent of it between them. In the United States, the Federal Reserve's own Distributional Financial Accounts report that at the end of 2024 the top tenth of households held 67 per cent of all household wealth and the bottom half held 2.5 per cent — an average of about eight million dollars a household at the top and about sixty thousand at the bottom half. Income is less concentrated than wealth but tells the same story: the World Inequality Lab puts the United States' top one per cent at around a fifth of national income and its top tenth at nearly half, and finds the poorest half of the population trailing the richest tenth in every region of the world. The degree varies — some nations are far more top-heavy than others, and a handful of mature economies have narrowed the gap somewhat — but the shape does not vary. There is no advanced nation-state on the planet today in which the few do not own the majority. Five thousand years of the pattern, and it is sitting in the current quarter's central-bank data.

PART 6

The Honest Edge

ON THE DISCIPLINE THE FRAMEWORK NEVER SUSPENDS, because a synthesis this sweeping is exactly the kind that curdles into fatalism if its edge is not held. It is a *tendency, not a law*, and it is never total — not 100 per cent, as you put it, but everywhere. Two people in the same apex position choose oppositely; some of the wealthy fund the counterweights that check their own class; some of the trusted pipelines, some of the time, tell the population what the apex did not want told. The structure positions people; it does not determine them, and the deviations are real and are where liberty gets its purchase. The claim is not that the tripod is a machine that grinds every outcome to the same dust. The claim is that, absent deliberate and maintained resistance, the three monopolies tend to gather into the same few hands, and that this tendency has been strong enough, over enough centuries, that its exceptions are partial and temporary rather than durable escapes.

And that is the honest resting place, the strongest thing that can be said on the other side, and it must be stated at full strength because it is also the only practical hope the record actually supports. No population has ever escaped the three monopolies. But populations have, at times and for a while, *pried them apart* — forced the violence, the wealth, and the trusted channels to be held by more than one hand at once, so that no single tripod stood unopposed. Multiple faiths permitted to check one another; courts that could read the law against the powerful who appointed them; a press the apex did not own; competing centres of wealth that could not all be bought at once; rival schools of expertise whose published disagreement let the layman see that a question was genuinely open. None of these abolished

the monopolies. Each of them crowded them. And crowding is the whole of what has ever measurably improved a subjugated population's lot — not freedom from the structure, which is not on offer to the animal we are, but *contestability within it*: the standing, never-finished work of keeping each monopoly held by enough hands that it must answer to something outside itself. This is the reformist conclusion the corpus reaches by every road, and it is a smaller hope than the one the search set out to find. But it is the one the five thousand years support, and — this is the part that makes it worth everything — you can watch, in case after case, the subjugation close back in exactly when the crowding fails and one hand takes a monopoly whole. Contestability is not the consolation prize. It is the variable on which liberty actually turns. Everything else is the tripod re-manning itself.

PART 7

Running a Study Through the Three Monopolies

To use this lens on a case, hold the twelve modules exactly as they are and read them as tracing the assembly and defence of the three monopolies; the mapping is close and it sharpens the questions rather than replacing them. Modules 1 and 2 — the floor of force and the settlement — are the founding of the *violence* and *wealth* monopolies: who took the sword, against whom, and how the conquered wealth was divided among the coalition that would hold it. Modules 3 and 4 — the robe and formation — are the building of the *trusted-information* monopoly: what story was laid over the force, who its interpreters were, and how it was installed in each generation before it could be weighed. Modules 5 through 8 — the cost column, extraction, information and suppression, elite coordination — are the three monopolies *running and defending each other*: why the subject complies, how the surplus is drawn and where it goes, how rival pipelines are silenced or bought or cloned, and how the apex holds together by default without a cabal. Module 9 — plurality or foreclosure — is the decisive one, because it is the direct measure of whether each monopoly is held by one hand or crowded by many, which is the variable on which the whole reading turns. Modules 10 and 11 — change, collapse, and the grim accounting — are what happens when a monopoly cracks, and whether the rupture crowded the tripod or merely re-manned it, with the metabolic death of a torn-out coordination counted honestly against the

combat dead. And Module 12 turns the case back on the corpus and on this synthesis itself, holding it as tested, not revealed.

Add three questions to any case, and they will earn their place every time. *Who holds each of the three monopolies, and are any of the three held by more than one hand?* — the single fastest read of how free or foreclosed the order is. *Where are the trusted pipelines, who owns them, and what happened to the last rival pipeline that appeared?* — the question that finds the load-bearing leg and tests whether the other two are guarding it. And *when this order changed or fell, did the three monopolies disperse into more hands or gather again into few?* — the question that separates the rare reform that widened liberty from the common rupture that only changed the names above the same three doors. Two signatures tell a worse order from a better. The signature of *capture* is convergence: the same hands, or allied hands, holding violence and wealth and the trusted channels together, rivals in each silenced or bought, the seat of trust sealed to one interpreter. The signature of *contestability* is that the three are pried apart and made to answer — a sword under law it does not write, a wealth that cannot buy every channel, a trusted pipeline that competes with others it cannot silence. Find which signature the case shows, and hold it as a tendency and not a verdict, and you have read the order at its foundation.

A Note on the Present-Day Figures

The wealth and income figures in Part 5 are verified and current as of this writing and are attributed in the text to their primary sources: the United States wealth shares (top tenth 67 per cent, bottom half 2.5 per cent, end of 2024) are from the Federal Reserve Board's Distributional Financial Accounts, reported via the Federal Reserve Bank of

St. Louis; the global wealth shares (the top tenth above half of personal wealth in almost every country; roughly sixty million adults holding close to half of world household wealth; the bottom forty per cent of adults under one per cent) are from the World Inequality Database and UBS's Global Wealth Report; and the income shares (the United States top one per cent near a fifth, top tenth near half of national income, the bottom half trailing the top tenth in every region) are from the World Inequality Lab. Figures of this kind move a point or two year to year and differ by method — wealth is more concentrated than income, and surveys understate the top — but the shape is stable across every source and every recent year, and the load-bearing claim is the shape, not the decimal. The framework's terms — the floor of force, the settlement, the robe and the seam, the two dials, formation, the exploit, the division of knowing, contestability — are developed across the corpus and named in the text so that this synthesis stands alone. *Part of the collection* Patterns of Power. Tested, never revealed.